

for granted really were things, whether its facts actually were facts, or mere notions, taken as given because never objectively and dispassionately scrutinised. They do scrutinise them, both objectively and dispassionately. Their originality consists in their complete power of divesting their eyes of the glass of habit which colours the vision of nearly everyone, without his being aware of it. They take nothing for granted. The great argument for Capitalism, that it exists, is to them, quite simply, no argument at all.

This sapping and mining of the foundations of Capitalist economics, like this revelation that economics was, in fact, Capitalist economics, was the more effective because, until they wrote their two books on Socialism, in the period after the War, they promulgated no large-scale dispensation of their own. They implied Socialism, in every word they wrote, and no one who read their words was in any doubt as to what they meant by it, but they never waved any banners. They criticised current pre-sumptions, from a definite and clear point of view, which interpenetrates their historical descriptions and directs the logic of the subsequent analysis, but that point of view invariably appears as a deduction from facts.

Rejection of the inspired or dialectical method, was as has already been noted, a natural impulse in the mental processes of both, before they met in collaboration sharpened this native aversion from large schematic generalisations,

and the entire superstructure of Hegelian-
Marxian ideology
They are not ideologists, nor are they
doctrinaire If
they ever seem so, the reason is that their
passion for order
makes them prone to identifications and
classifications.
They never forget that economics is a
human science,
at the same time, they are apt to over-simplify
these same
humans, and to get them too easily into
expressive categories.
When it is a question of facts, and the
ordering of those